-- if Mr. Grubb was in the passenger seat of the car he 1 could be facing out the driver's window and somebody could 2 shoot from that side with his head down like this to 3 accomplish that same path, or there could be somebody on 4 the passenger side. 5 From your experience would that be the more Q 6 likely circumstance? 7 MR. WHIGHAM: We object. 8 MR. JINKS: Based on his opinion. 9 THE COURT: Well, if he has any experience. 10 If you have an opinion. MR. JINKS: 11 WITNESS: It would be the passenger side. 12 Thank you. That is all. MR. JINKS: 13 MR. BOWDEN: We have no questions. 14 Thank you, sir. MR. WHIGHAM: That is all. 15 Thank you. You may be excused. THE COURT: 16 Thank you. WITNESS: 17 (THEREUPON, the witness was excused 18 from the stand.) 19 Judge, it's about time for a MR. WHIGHAM: 20 That is the last witness that we are going to break. 21 have. 22 It is about time for a break. THE COURT: 23 Let's take about a ten-minute break. 24 (THEREUPON, the jury retired from 25

the courtroom at which time the following proceedings were had out of their presence.)

DEFENDANT NUNLEY'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL

MR. JINKS: Judge, at this time the Defendant Corey Nunley moves for a Judgment of Acquittal in the case against him, and the reason, on the basis that the case should not be submitted to the jury because the State has failed to present legal evidence from which the jury could by fair inference find him guilty. Also, it should not be submitted to the jury because the State has failed to meet its burden of proof, and its evidence is not sufficient to uphold the conviction of the defendant for murder; also, it should not be submitted to the jury because the evidence presented is insufficient to support a finding of guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

In order to defeat this motion the State must prove by substantial evidence the elements of the charge and the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The evidence in this case against Corey Nunley is only that taken in the light, you know, most -- best for the State, he was in the back seat of the car. I don't think that is enough corroboration to support his conviction solely on the testimony of a co-defendant. I think there is a statute on that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 247

you find them to be, and apply those true facts to the law as I'm giving it to you now.

Now, let's talk for a minute about the crime of murder with which these defendants are charged. defendants are charged with murder. Under the Code of Alabama, Code Section 13A-6-2, and the particular section of the Code under which they are charged or under which I'm charging you, is (a)(3), which is also known as felony "A person commits the crime of murder if he commits or attempts to commit robbery in any degree." there are some other felonies but that is the only one I'm going to talk to you about. "A person commits the crime of murder if he commits or attempts to commit the crime of Robbery in the First Degree, and in the course of the crime or in the furtherance of the crime or in the immediate flight therefrom he is committing or attempts to commit, he or another participant causes the death of any person." Okay. Let's go over that one more time. "A person commits the crime of murder if he commits or attempts to commit robbery in any degree, and in the course or furtherance of the immediate flight from that crime he or another participant -- another person in the attempt to commit the crime of robbery causes the death of any person."

Okay. So, what must the State of Alabama have proved to you before you would be entitled to convict

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 248

either of these defendants? Well, the first thing they must have proved to you is that Robert Grubbs Junior is dead. Okay. That is stipulated. Nobody doubts that. Secondly, that the defendant Corey Nunley and that the defendant Terrence Robinson or that the defendant -remember there are two cases, so you have got to decide this for both gentleman, so the law as I'm giving to you applies to both of them -- first, that Robert Grubbs Junior is dead; that the defendant Corey Nunley or Terrence Robinson either caused the death of him or participated in the crime with the other gentleman that got on the stand by shooting him -- by shooting Robert Grubbs, and that in committing the act which caused the death of Robert Grubbs the defendant or another participant in the crime was acting in the course of and in the furtherance of the crime of, or in the immediate flight of robbery in any degree, and that in doing the act which constituted the commission or the alleged commission of the felony robbery, during the course of which or in the furtherance of which or in the immediate flight of which the death of Robert Grubbs was caused by O'Neal Jackson or any other participants. participant in the context of this offense is one who would be legally accountable either as being one of the procured -- one who is procured, induced, or caused or the one doing the procuring or causing or aiding and abetting the

commission of the alleged offense.

Now, in order for you to decide whether the crime of robbery was committed or either attempted to be committed I need to read to you the definition of robbery. "A person commits the crime of Robbery in the First Degree if in the course of committing a theft he uses or threatens the use of imminent force against the person, the owner of the property or any person present with the intent to overcome that person's physical resistance or physical power of resistance, and in doing so he causes serious physical injury to another person." That is robbery. So, if you find that any of the three committed robbery on Pete Bethune or attempted to commit robbery on Pete Bethune, and that in the course of committing that robbery or attempting to commit that robbery Robert Junior Grubbs was killed, then anybody -- any participant in that robbery or attempted robbery would be guilty of murder if they either shot the gun or aided or -- had the gun or aided and abetted the person that did the shooting in committing the robbery or attempting to commit the robbery. So, what that means in this case is, if you find that O'Neal Jackson robbed or attempted to rob Pete Bethune, and during the course of that robbery that he shot and killed Robert Junior Grubbs, and further that either of the defendants aided or abetted in the attempted commission of the

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

· 21

22

23

24

25

Page 250

robbery, then they would be guilty of murder just as if they pulled the trigger.

Now, I want to talk to you about what aiding and abetting means. What does that mean to aid and abet somebody in the commission of a crime? Well, "aiding and abetting comprehends all assistance rendered by acts, words of encouragement or support or presents actual or constructive to render any assistance should it become necessary and no particular acts are necessary." Let me read that to you one more time. "A person aids and abets another, and aiding and abetting as used in the law comprehends all assistance rendered by acts, words of encouragement or support." It can be done by your acts or just by you encouraging him to do it or supporting him in his furtherance of that crime, "or the actual presence or the constructive presence of a participant at the scene in order to render assistance should it become necessary and no particular acts are necessary." So, that is the law of aiding and abetting.

Now, if you find from the evidence that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of the offense of murder as charged, then you should find the defendants guilty of murder. If you find the State has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more of the elements of murder, as I have just

Page 251

explained them to you, then you should find the defendants not guilty.

Now, the lawyers have a right to ask me to read written requested charges to you that they submit, and if they are correct statements of the law, and I haven't said them in my oral charge, I'm duty bound to read those to you. So, I'll read some written requested charges to you now.

A person acts intentionally with respect to a result or to conduct when his or her purpose is to cause that result or engage in that conduct.

A person acts knowingly with respect to conduct or to a circumstance which he or she is aware that his or her conduct is of the nature or that the circumstances exists.

The minimum requirement for holding a person criminally liable is there must be at least: (1) performance by that person or a voluntary act; and (2) the voluntary omission to perform that an act which he is physically capable of performing.

If a culpable mental state is required on the part of the defendant with respect to any material element of the crime charged, then the crime is said to be one of "mental culpability". It requires that at the time of voluntary commission of an act or of voluntary omission

· 21

Page 252

of an act which the person is physically capable of performing, he must have acted: intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence.

Where the crime charged requires some degree of mental culpability on the part of the defendant, that mental culpability is required as to every essential element of the crime unless the statute defining the crime indicates to the contrary.

A person is criminally liable for a result if the result would not have occurred but for his conduct.

A person is criminally liable for a result whether the result was caused by solely by the accused person's conduct or was caused by his conduct and another cause acting concurrently, unless the other cause, standing alone, was sufficient to produce the result of the conduct of the accused person was clearly insufficient to do so.

I wonder who wrote that law.

A person is not legally accountable for the behavior of another person -- excuse me, I'm not going to give that one.

If you entertain a reasonable doubt as to any fact or element necessary to constitute the defendant's guilt, it is your duty to give him the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of not guilty. Even where the evidence demonstrates a probability of guilt, if it does

` 21

Page 253

not establish such guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, you must acquit the accused. This doubt, however, must be a reasonable one; that is, one that is founded on a real tangible substantial basis and not upon mere caprice and conjecture. It is a doubt that a reasonable man can seriously entertain.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, if the State has failed in its burden to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, based on all the evidence, that Corey Nunley participated in a robbery or a theft of money from Willie James Bethune which resulted in the death of Robert Charles Junior Grubbs, you must acquit him and find him not guilty of the offense charged in the indictment.

I charge the jury that the county in which a witness resides is not a valid factor for you, the jury, to consider in weighing the credibility or believability of the witness.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, you are the sole judges as to the weight that should be given to all the testimony. Whenever possible, you should attempt to reconcile all the evidence.

If you are unable to reconcile the evidence, however, then it is your job to weigh the evidence and to give more weight to that evidence which you find to be more believable. If in making this determination, you should

. 21

Page 254

leave all personal biases and prejudices outside the courtroom. You should be concerned solely with the evidence which came forth from the witness stand.

You are permitted, however, to consider the witness's demeanor and attitude on the stand, his sincerity, and the credibility of what is said. If, after considering all the evidence in this case, you have a reasonable doubt growing out of the evidence, you must acquit the defendant.

The court charges the jury that, if you believe any witness's testimony has been contradicted in any material part, you could choose to believe all of that witness's testimony.

The court chargesthe jury that, if you find from the evidence that any witness has made contradictory statements as to any material facts, you may look at these contradictory statements in order to determine what credence you will give to the testimony as a whole of the said witness.

You, the jury, are instructed that proof of contradictory statements or declarations of a material point made by a witness may be sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt in the minds of a jury as to the truth of the testimony of that witness.

I charge you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that a

` 21

Page 255

reasonable doubt is sometimes said to be a doubt for which a reason can be given. It must spring from the evidence of the case and the evidence only. It after careful consideration of the evidence you have a doubt arising from the evidence or any part of the evidence of the defendant's guilt, if such doubt seems to be reasonable to you, the defendant should be acquitted.

I charge you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the burden is on the State to convince you by the evidence presented in this case the guilt of the defendant to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt.

where there is reasonable doubt as to whether the killing was done with intent, the accused cannot be convicted of murder.

If there was reasonable doubt of the accused's guilt upon the whole evidence he must be acquitted.

The court charges you, the jury, are the judge of the facts of the case and the credibility of the witnesses who have testified.

I charge you that mere speculation, conjecture, or surmise will not authorize you to return a verdict of guilt.

I charge you that the mere possibility and submissions -- excuse me, suspicions or guesswork will not

Page 256 overcome the presumption of innocence. 1 Let me see the lawyers outside. 2 (WHEREUPON, the following 3 proceedings were held outside the 4 presence of the jury as follows:) 5 THE COURT: With that is the State satisfied? 6 MR. WHIGHAM: State is satisfied. 7 THE COURT: Is the Defendant Nunley satisfied? 8 Judge, we would like to ask for 9 MR. SMITHART: additional charges to be given, Charges 12, 13, 14, 15, and 10 16. 11 THE COURT: Well, I charged that. 13 is 12 reasonable doubt, I think I gave plenty of those on 13 14, already given presumption of innocence. 14 Proof, I have already given that. I told them that is 15 the evidence. I already told them that. 16, I have 16 already talked about conjecture. That is reasonable 17 doubt. I think I have covered that enough. 18 MR. SMITHART: The only one left would be the 19 charge on the verdict. 20 THE COURT: I'm going to tell them that when I 21 walk out. 22

That is all.

THE COURT: Defendant Robinson?

MR. BOWDEN: Satisfied, your Honor.

MR. SMITHART:

23

24

25

MRS. HICKS: Satisfied.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

(THEREUPON, the hearing held out of

the presence of the jury was

concluded.)

(WHEREUPON, the following

proceedings were had in the

presence of the jury as follows:)

Ladies and Gentlemen, you have THE COURT: heard all the charges, all the testimony, and all the arguments of the lawyers. It is time now for you to retire and begin your deliberations and reach a verdict. Take the evidence and in an impartial and honest way determine what you believe to be the truth. If you find that any of the testimony of any witness in this case was willfully false, you may disregard any or all the testimony of that witness. You take the testimony and reconcile it as you can do so from the witnesses, but, as I told you, the credibility of the witnesses is up to you, for you to decide. As I told you in my first statement to you, take your -- everything in which you in your everyday lives would pass on whether somebody was being truthful with you and determine what the truth is. And take the evidence with all the reasonable and proper inferences therefrom, and in an impartial and honest way determine what you believe to be the truth,

Page 258

apply that truth to the law as I have given it to you and reach a verdict.

The first thing you should do is elect one of your number as foreperson, begin your deliberations.

And your verdict must be the verdict of each and every one of you. It must be unanimous, all twelve of you must agree on either a guilty or a not guilty verdict.

If you find the State has met its burden of proof, and proved the defendants' guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, the verdict would be, "We, the Jury, find the defendant guilty of murder as charged in the indictment."

If, on the other hand, you find the State has failed to meet its burden of proof and hasn't proved all the elements of the crime of murder as charged, "We, the Jury, find the defendant not guilty of murder as charged in the indictment." You have one form for each defendant. One form for Mr. Nunley, one form on Mr. Robinson.

Retire now and begin your deliberations.

You can take a break. Any of you that need to take one,
take it at any time. Ask the bailiff and he will let you
go, and then come back in. But while anybody is out, don't
deliberate or discuss the case. Don't discuss the case or
deliberate unless all twelve of you are in the room to
participate.

With that you may retire and begin your

deliberations.

(THEREUPON, the jury retired to begin their deliberations at the hour of 5:10 p.m.)

JURY VERDICT

(6:25 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, have you reached a verdict in the case of State of Alabama versus Corey L. Nunley, Case Number CC-94-76, and is this your verdict: "We, the Jury, find the Defendant Corey Nunley guilty of murder as charged in the indictment," signed Emma Jean Frost, Foreperson? I'm going to point to each of you and ask if this is your verdict. If it is, yes; if not, no.

Is it yours, ma'am?

(THEREUPON, each of the twelve jurors nodded their heads up and down in response to the court's question.)

All right.

In the case of the State of Alabama versus
Terrence Robinson, Case Number CC-94-74, "We, the Jury,
find the Defendant Terrence Robinson guilty of murder as
charged in the indictment," signed Imagene Sparks,
Foreperson.

` 21

Page 260

Again, ma'am, is this your verdict?

(THEREUPON, each of the jurors

nodded their heads up and down in response to the court's question.)

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. You have done your city, your county, and the state a service of which we are all appreciative.

If you have another case, the cases for tomorrow, Thursday, and Friday are still on. So, if you have one of those cases we will see you then; if not, you are excused. And thank you very much for participating.

In you need an excuse the clerk will give you an excuse for your job; otherwise, he will mail you your checks later.

Thank you very much.

(THEREUPON, the jury departed the courtroom at which time the following proceedings were held out of the jury's presence.)

COURT'S ADJUDICATION OF GUILT

THE COURT: Mr. Robinson, a jury of your peers has found you guilty of the crime of murder, and the Court does now adjudge you guilty of the crime of murder.

Y'all want a presentence report?

MR. BOWDEN: Yes, your Honor.